

article which was just recently published shows that in the area of bingo and lotteries by two flukes which I mentioned earlier on this floor, a Supreme Court decision on the Big Green lottery, the openness of the Nebraska law and an Attorney General's opinion, that Nebraska by virtue of those two things has probably the most wide-opened gambling legislation, other than Las Vegas, in the United States, even more wide-opened than Las Vegas in certain areas because they have regulations. Now the essence of all these amendments that we have adopted in 351 is to try to bring this under control. Rather than to say we are going to outlaw gambling completely, we are going to say lotteries and bingo and some of these things should be left to exist as they were designed back in, when it was, 1958 or whatever, but it should be kept within those constraints, in other words, nonprofit organizations, beneficial purposes and on a very tightly regulated scale. So now let's move into the Barnett amendment. One of the methods, one of the methods that the abuse occurs was that licenses were obtained wholesale by various groups and then literally turned over, sold, leased out, whatever you want to call it, to other people who were business, I use the word loosely, who were businessmen, let's say. With the rest of the bill, the balance of the bill, I think we have tightly constrained this type of activity and prevented it from occurring in the area of bingo and a lot of other areas. Now the bottom line then gets to be, is Senator Barnett's amendment necessary so that some of these groups that don't have their own bingo halls can exist. I have thought about it and thought about it and thought about it. I don't want to jeopardize the rest of the bill but I don't want to put out of business some of these legitimate organizations. So let's say there are two or three organizations, let's say, I am just using examples now, the Benevolent Brothers of whatever and let's say a church organization and maybe a school, let's say none of them have their own facilities but they can legitimately rent one facility, one building, one for ten days, another for ten days and another for ten days. The question then gets to be, should they be allowed to do this or will this open it wide open like it was before. I guess I feel satisfied, after thinking about it more and more and more, that this would open it up a little but the thrust or the overall intent of the legislation would still be maintained, the regulation would be there even if this amendment were adopted. So what I am telling you is I am personally going to vote for the amendment. I originally was not, but I feel if the balance, if the balance of the amendments are kept, we will have the regulation that is required and we will have resolved I think almost any legitimate problem by a group worried about being put out of existence. So use your own judgment. I am going to support the amendment just to resolve that particular question with an understanding that it does weaken it some but I don't think it jeopardizes to any great degree the overall intent of the bill. Some of this literature I am handing out, I wish you would read, for example, the last page or the last couple of pages of that Law Review article in which they summarize and show you just how wide open it is in this state in the area of gambling. I wish you would read some of these other. For example, the Morland Act Commission Report and some of these things, where it shows what happened in New York, California and other little states, little states, when they, let's say,